

## REMARKS

### *Summary*

The abstract of the disclosure and Claims 1, 2, 5-9 and 12-18 have been amended to overcome a formal objections and rejection thereto, and to improve their form, and rejected Claims 19 and 20 have been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, the application is now in allowable form.

### *Status of the Claims*

Claims 1, 2, 5-9 and 12-18 are pending, with Claims 1, 2, 8, and 9 being independent. Claims 1, 2, 5-9 and 12-18 have been amended to overcome a formal objection thereto by changing “reproducing” to --refurbishing--, as suggested by the Examiner. The remaining amendments to Claims 1, 2, 5-9, and 12-18 are unrelated to patentability and are being made to improve the form of the claims. Claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 19 and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

### *Requested Action*

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding objections and rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### *Abstract Objection*

The Abstract is objected to because of its length. In response, Applicants have amended the Abstract of the Disclosure to be less than 150 words, in accordance with current U.S. practice.

### *Allowable Subject Matter*

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of Claims 1-18.

### *Formal Claim Objections*

Claims 1-20 are objected to because the Examiner objects to the word “reproducing” as not accurately characterizing the invention in idiomatic English, and suggests replacing it with the word --refurbishing--. In response, Applicants have so amended the claims, thereby rendering the objection moot.

### *Substantive Rejections*

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being obvious over the patent to Higeta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,025) in view of the patent to Ryan (Great British Patent No. 2,287,904) and the patent to Berns et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,243,388). In addition, Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the patents to Higeta et al., Ryan, and Berns et al. in view of the patent to Haines et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,808,255).

### *Response to Substantive Rejection*

In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejections, Claims 19 and 20 have been canceled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejections moot.

*Drawing and Specification Amendments*


Applicants have amended Figures 2 and 15 to delete reference characters not discussed in the specification. Corrected formal drawings of these figures are enclosed. In addition, Applicants have amended the specification to improve its form and to correct minor and typographical errors therein.

*Conclusion*

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the application is now in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants  
Gary M. Jacobs  
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
GMJ:ayr

DC\_MAIN 211463v1

In the Drawings:

Please amend the drawings as follows, as shown on the enclosed corrected formal drawings thereof.

In Figure 2:

Delete reference numeral “6” and the lead line therefrom.

In Figure 15:

Delete reference characters “1e1”, “1e3”, and “1e4” and the lead lines therefrom.